

11.6.
(3)

THE MORALITY

OF THE
Seventh-day-Sabbath Disproved.

IN ANSWER
To *C. T. Tillam's* Book, Entituled,
A Present from Prison, Dedicat-
ed to L. C. Hobson.

WHEREIN
The most Material Points in another Book,
Entituled, *A Discourse of the Sabbath*, lately Pub-
lished by *Henry Sowersby* and *Mehetabel Smith*, are
succinctly discuss'd.

Written by the Learned *J. B. Master* of Arts, at the Request
of the laid *L. C. Hobson*.

Col. 2. 16, 17. *Let no man therefore judge you in Meat, or in
Drink, or in Respect of an Holy-day, or of the New Moon, or
of the Sabbaths, which are a shadow of things to come, but the
Body is of Christ.*

L O N D O N,
Printed by *Francis Clark* for *L. Curtis*. 1683.

The Morality of the Seventh-day-Sabbath Disproved, &c.

Page 1. **T**HE word *Moral*, according to the Common usage, is all one as to say *Natural*, and is opposed to that which is *Ceremonial*, or *Positive*, or of meer *Institution*.

This being so, (as you cannot be ignorant of) I wonder you should talk of removing the Veil of Obscurity lying upon the word *Moral*, unless it were, that wanting a solid Answer, you had a Mind to Quibble upon words; for you know that *Aristotle* and other Philosophers have written Books concerning *Moral* Duties, by which I believe you your self will confess, can be understood no other than those Duties that Natural Reason exacteth of all Men, as they are Men.

Page 2. In that you here barely say, that the main thing in Question is undeniable; namely, *That the Seventh day Sabbath is as Naturally Holy, as the six days are Naturally Common*. This to me seemeth plainly to Argue, that you had nothing material to alledge to prove your Assertion. Otherways you know well enough that I, and almost all other Christians whatsoever deny it: Yea, I for my part, had brought many (as I believe) convincing Reasons, to shew that I have good ground for the denial thereof. Neither doth it follow, that because God in the production of Natural things did not act unnaturally; neither was the Institution of the Seventh-day-Sabbath contrary to his Natural intention; therefore the Law of Nature doth require of all Men to observe the Sabbath: For to omit your own affirmation, that God instituted the Sabbath, which plainly sheweth it not to be *Natural*, and so *Moral* but *Positive*; I might by the same Reason Argue, that for as much as God did not act unnaturally

in-producing the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil; neither was it contrary to his Natural inclination to forbid the eating of the same; therefore it was a *Moral* and *Natural* Duty to abstain from it, which I think you your self will deny. If you do not, certain I am, that as you will scarce find any man that will Second you, so will it be altogether impossible for you to shew, that Natural Reason (letting aside the Commandments of God) did dictate unto *Adam*, that he ought to forbear the eating of that Tree above all the other Trees of the Garden. Or why (if it be a *Natural* and *Moral* Duty) the same Tree is not set forth to us by God, that we may shew our Obedience by abstaining from it. These Expressions of yours, that God did Celebrate and Observe the Seventh day Sabbath are unsound, there being no such thing affirmed of God in the Scripture, but only of Men, see *Levit. 23. 32. From Even to Even shall you Celebrate your Sabbath.* And *Exod. 31. 16. The Children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their Generations.* For to Celebrate and Observe, such or such a time, argueth that it hath been Commanded by some other. Moreover when God is said to have Sanctified or Hallowed the Sabbath, it was not that *he himself*, but that *Men* should observe and keep it holy, as appeareth by the Fourth Commandment.

Page 3. Your Comparison between a Wife in Relation to her Husband, and the Sabbath in Relation to a Christian, doth not hold. For Marriage, though in the beginning instituted of God, is yet not of institution, but of Nature; the difference of Sects Naturally requiring it without such an Institution. And this (as I am told) is acknowledged by *Aristotle* the best Naturallist that ever was, who saith, *Eth. 8. Chap. 12. That there is naturally Friendship betwixt Man and Woman, and that Man was Naturally made, rather for Marriage than for Civil Society.* But no such thing as this can (I believe) be alledged out of *Aristotle* concerning the Observation of the Sabbath.

Page 4. That other Similitude of yours between the Sun and the Sabbath, being wholly of your own making, without any hint of the Scripture, is altogether frivolous, and proveth nothing.

nothing. And whereas you Advise me to cease Polluting of the Sabbath, in as much as I have (say you) acknowledged the Seventh-day-Sabbath to be Holy by Divine Institution. I wonder you should so boldly impose on me, when you know sufficiently, even by this very writing of mine, which you endeavour to answer, that I deny the Seventh-day-Sabbath now to be Holy, believing it, as being a shadow, to be done away by Christ. Neither doth that Passage, *Heb. 4. 9.* intimate the contrary. For when that Divine Author saith, *there remaineth therefore a rest,* (so I am told the word *καταπαυσις* rightly rendred, as will appear by two passages of the Septuagint, *Exod. 16. 30. Lev. 23. 32.* where the word is so used) *to the People of God,* he meaneth not the rest of the Seventh-day-Sabbath, but the rest of the Kingdom of Heaven, or (as the Author stileth it, Verse the 10.) *the rest of God, into which whosoever is entred, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his.*

But to cease from our own works, as God did from his, is to cease from them, as never to return again to them; not to cease for one day, and then to Labour again as before. Again, this rest is inferred from those words, *verse. 6.* and so are meant of such a *rest,* into which the *Israelites* did not enter because of Unbelief. But *Moses* testifieth that they kept the Rest of the Seventh-day-Sabbath, *Exod. 16. 30.* Moreover, this is a Rest into which we should labour to enter; but there needeth no labouring to rest on the Seventh-day-Sabbath. Finally, when it is here said, *there remaineth a Rest,* this plainly implied that the Rest here spoken of, is something that is reserved for the People of God, and so not enjoyed at present, and therefore not the Rest of the Seventh-day-Sabbath. Thus much appeareth from the same word thus used in the 6th. Verse foregoing.

Page 6. Your saying, *That the Seventh day is every way Moral, both by Natural Production, and by Primitive Institution,* sheweth plainly, that you are mistaken in the true Notion of *Moral,* and my use of the same. For I (as appeareth by my words, which you cite, *page 1.*) distinguish that which is *Moral* from that which is of *Institution,* esteeming that to be *Moral,*

Moral, which the light of Nature dictateth, that it ought to be, or at least may laudably be done, though God had not Instituted, and enjoyed the same; which if you can make good, concerning the Observation of the Seventh-day-Sabbath, then will I readily assent to you that it is *Moral*.

Page 7. Where did you learn, that the work of *the Law*, written in mens Natural hearts, is the Old Covenant? For, doth not the Scripture oppose the New Covenant to that Covenant which God made with the Children of *Israel*, when he brought them out of *Egypt*, *Heb. 8. 8, 9, 10.* And doth not the Author of that Epistle, in the 13th. Verse affirm, That in as much as he saith, a new Covenant, he hath made the first old? So that it undeniably follows, That the first Covenant which God made with the *Israelites*, when he brought them out of *Egypt*, is the Old Covenant. It is also as evident, that the words of the Law is that Old Covenant, there being no other Old Covenant, but the Law delivered in Writing by *Moses*. Again, where did you learn, That the words of the Law, written in the Christians hearts, is the new Covenant? 'Tis true indeed that the Scriptures saith, the New Covenant consisteth in this, That God will write his Laws in his peoples hearts, but doth not affirm, that he will write the words of the Law (whereby *Moses* Law is usually alone understood in the Scripture) on their Hearts: So that by the laws which God promiseth to write on the Hearts of his People, must needs be understood, not the laws which he had formerly delivered by *Moses*, the Mediator of the Old Covenant, but those which he would afterwards deliver by *Christ*, the Mediator of the New Covenant. Whereby you may perceive, that the New Covenant differs from the Old in the very laws that were written, as well as in the Tables whereon they were written, (these being Tables of the Heart, the other Tables of stone) and also in the Instrument of writing them, (these being written by the Spirit of the Living God, the other with Ink) 2 Cor. 3. 3. So that your Error in distinguishing (as you did) the Old Covenant from the New, is conspicuous. As for those words then, *Rom. 2. 15. by the works of the law*, is meant the works of *Moses* Law (for of that it is treated

treated in the fore-going words) and consequently the word or matter, or things (for these Expressions amount to the same) of *Moses* Law, written in the Hearts of the *Gentiles*; nor the things that are therein, meerly of Institution, and so Ceremonial or Positive, (for none can know such things unless they be told him) but only those that be Natural and Moral. For that such things of the Law were written in the Hearts of the *Gentiles*, appeareth every where by their writings, and for the breach of them they are reproved in the Scripture, as the *Tyrrians* are blamed for not keeping Covenant, *Amos* 1. 9. The *Edomites* for Cruelty, *ibid.* ver. 11. The *Ammorites*, for insulting over other mens Calamities, *Ezek.* 25. 3. But no where shall you find, that the Heathens are Rebuked in Scripture for not keeping the Sabbath; neither is there any hint in their Writings, that they thought themselves bound to such a Duty. Wherefore it is manifest, that the keeping of the Sabbath is no Moral Duty, which the Light of Nature doth dictate unto men, that they ought to perform. But you will, perhaps, demand of me, how the Condition of Christians excelleth that of Heathens and Jews, if the work of the Law was written in the Hearts of the one, as *Paul* testifieth, and the word of the Law was in the Heart of the other, as *Moses* saith, *Deut.* 30. 14. The word is nigh thee, in thy Mouth, and in thy Heart, that thou mayest do it. I Answer, that the difference lyeth chiefly in two things: First, the things of the Law are not said to be written in the Hearts either of Jews or Heathens, by the Spirit of the living God, (and so not so plainly and so easily Legible to them) the contrary whereof is affirmed of Christians. Secondly, their Hearts are not said to be Hearts of Flesh, but on the contrary, the Jews hearts are called hearts of stone, *Ezek.* 11. 19. which may be as truly affirmed of the Heathens hearts; whereas the hearts of Christians are by *Paul* termed Hearts of Flesh, *2 Cor.* 3. 3.

Page 9. You are here, as well as in other passages of your Book, somewhat injurious to me, in imposing that upon me, which I neither said nor meant. For did I give this as a ground for us to forget the Seventh-day-Sabbath, because God hath

hath Commanded us to remember it? Yea, do I not again and again tell you, that God hath no where Commanded us Christiansto remember any such Sabbath?

What can I with Reason conclude from hence, but that you had a mind to render me Contemprible in the eyes of the Brethren, by ascribing so Ridiculous a kind of Reasoning to me? As little ingenious is your Reprehension of me, a little after, saying, that I am mistaken, in denying that to be Naturally Moral which depends upon Memory, where you leave out the words, *as to know*, as you do in sundry other Passages afterwards, which expression quite varieth the Case. For certainly that which a man cannot know but by means of his memory, is such a thing as is not Naturally written in his heart, but suggested to him from without. Neither doth the greatness and goodness of God depend upon memory, *as to know*, which words you again leave out, dealing as unfaithfully as before. For it is Naturally imprinted in the Heart of every man, that God is good and great, but not that we ought to keep the Seventh-day Sabbath, as will appear to any man that is acquainted with the Writings of such as are merely Naturalists.

The Gospel, as to the principle Mysteries thereof, transcendeth the Natural Understanding of man to find out: For so the Apostle intimateth, when he saith, *We preach the things that neither Eye hath seen, nor Ear hath heard, neither hath it come up into the Heart of man*. Wherefore no man was bound to know, or publish these things without Divine Revelation and Command. And consequently they are not Naturally Moral, that being Naturally Moral, which is taught by the Light of Nature.

Page 12. 'Tis true, a Child can of himself no more know who are his Parents, than he can which is the Seventh day. But prove that it is as much written in the Nature and Heart of man, that he should Celebrate the Seventh day, when he is told which day of the Week is it, as that he should honour his Parents, when he hath once learned who are they. Were this so, the Heathen, who are very studious of the Law of Nature, and have left us Excellent Treatises concerning the same,

same, would as well have delivered Precepts about the Observation of the Sabbath, as they do about Honouring our Parents.

Pag. 13. When I affirm, that the Sabbath was a sign of Gods Sanctifying his own People, you would (had you intended the finding out of the Truth, and not abusing both of your self and others with a vain shew) easily have perceived by the Text cited by me out of *Ezekiel*, for the Proof thereof, that I meant it in relation to Gods People, under the Old Covenant, and not under the New.

Pag. 14. You deny that ever the Sabbath did stoop to any Law, either Ceremonial or Moral, because (say you) this and other Moral Laws have evermore submitted to the Will and Pleasure of the Royal Law-giver. How doth this disprove my Argument, unless you do withal shew, that the Law-giver never willed the Precept of the Sabbath to be broken, that other Precepts might be kept? The contrary whereof is very evident from the Texts of Scripture that I have alledged in my third Reason; also from *Numb. 28. 9.* where certain Sacrifices are enjoyned by God, to be Offered on the Sabbath day, which could not be done without the breach of the Fourth Commandment of the Decalogue, where all manner of Work is forbidden on that day. Accordingly, the Priests on the Sabbath-day did in the Temple Profane the Sabbath, and were blameless, as Christ speaketh, *Mat. 12. 5.* Here you see plainly that the Law of the Sabbath is broken, and that by the Will of God, that the Law of Sacrifices might be kept. But you shall never find in the Scripture, that the Law concerning Mercy, Righteousness, Faith, or any other, undoubted Moral Duty, is ever Profaned, that the Sabbath might be kept. For when you alledge on the contrary, that the Moral Law, which saith, *Thou shalt not steal, or Covet*, doth stoop as low as that of the Sabbath, and for Proof thereof, cite *Exod. 11. 2.* you are mistaken, for the *Israelites* are there Commanded by God, neither to *Steal*, nor to *Covet*, but only (as I am told the inspection of the *Hebrew* words will inform you) to ask of the *Egyptians* Vessels of Silver, and Vessels of Gold. But to ask something of another,

was never yet counted to be a breach of either the Eighth or Tenth Commandment of the Decalogue. Neither is that Moral Law, *Thou shalt not kill*, violated; or as you term it, prostituted by that Command of God, *Gen. 22. 12.* For as much as the killing forbidden in the sixth Commandment, is by God himself, *Exod. 21. 12, 14.* explained to be coming upon a man presumptuously, and slaying him with guile; neither of which can be said of *Abraham's* attempt to slay his Son, he having received an express Commandment from God to do it. Neither was that Moral sentence of acquitting the Innocent, and condemning the Wicked, subjected, and as it were, subverted (so you are pleased to speak) in the Death of Christ; for the *Jews* that Condemned and killed Christ, are by God in the Scripture pronounced to have done it by Wicked hands, *Acts 2. 23.* and they accordingly exhorted to Repent, that they might receive the Remission of their sins, *ver. 38.* Which Justification is not contrary to those words of the Law, *I will not Justifie the Wicked*, *Exod. 23. 7.* Which are meant of such a Justification, whereby the Wicked Person is Approved and Vindicated, and not whereby he is Forgiven upon his Repentance, and turning from his Wickedness.

You should have done rightly to prove, and not barely assert, that Nature's Law never allowed a man to have more Wives than one: For though I freely grant, that the Law of Nature doth dictate it to be better for a man to content himself with one Wife, yet doth it not suggest that the contrary is sinful, howbeit the Law of Christ hath now made it so. And a wonder it is to see what pains many men take (but without success) to prove that Polygamy is contrary to the Law of Nature. You should likewise have proved, that the Act of *Hosea* the Prophet, in Marrying one that had been an Harlot, was against the Law either of God or Nature, and not have taken it for granted.

Pag. 16. When the Disciples of Christ did pull the Ears of Corn on the Sabbath-day, and eat them, rubbing them with their Hands, they did (as the *Pharisees* objected to them) what was not Lawful to do on the Sabbath. For though the Law allowed

allowed a man to pull Ears of Corn in another mans Field, *Dent. 23. 25.* yet might not this be done on the Sabbath, as being a breach of the Fourth Commandment. This that I have said is further confirmed by our Saviours Answer to the *Pharisees*, wherein are so many notable Considerations, clearly evincing the Ceremoniality of the Sabbath, that this one History is abundantly sufficient to determine the Question in Debate between us. For first, our Saviour defendeth the breach of the Sabbath in his Disciples, by the Act of *David*, who being hungry, brake the Ceremonial Law of God, in eating the Shew-bread, which none but the Priests were allowed to eat. But should our Saviour have defended the breach of a *Moral Law*, by the breach of a *Ceremonial* one, who would not presently have discerned the disparity? Secondly, he Justifieth it by the deed of the Priests, who Offering Sacrifices in the Temple on the Sabbath, did Profane the same, and yet were blameless. Where he intimateth that the Temple was more Sacred than the Sabbath, because in that place the Sabbath was Profaned without blame. Thirdly, he Argueth that the Disciples did well in breaking the Sabbath upon so urgent an Occasion, because God desired Mercy and not Sacrifice: Where by Mercy he meaneth all Moral Duties, among which Mercy is eminent; as by Sacrifices he understandeth all Ceremonial and positive Duties, in as much as Sacrifice is chief among such performances. That this is the right meaning of the words, and not that Fancy of yours touching the Sacrifice of the Sabbath, appeareth by the use of them to the same purpose, *Mat. 9. 13.* For when the *Pharisees* blamed our Saviour for eating with Publicans and Sinners, Christ, in defence of himself, biddeth them go and learn what that is, *I will have Mercy and not Sacrifice*: Thereby intimating that to abstain from such Company, was to be reckoned amongst Sacrifice and Ceremonial things; but to be Familiar with them of purpose to Convert them, was a work of Mercy, and so might be upon Occasion observed with the breach of the other. This being so perspicuous, how is it that you should say, *That till now you never met with any that charged our Saviour with putting upon the Sabbath the Title of Sacrifice*; since it is apparent by the

Discourse and Practice of all Christians in general throughout the whole World, that they esteem the Observation of the Seventh-day-Sabbath to be Ceremonial, and so fitly comprised by our Saviour, under the appellation of Sacrifice. Again, how is it, that to deceive the simple, you should cast forth so many empty Expostulations, and talk of my censuring Christ himself as Ceremonial? To which purpose you alledge (though very impertinently) these words, *Heb. 10. 12. But this man, after he had offered one Sacrifice for sins.* And whereas it is evident, that the word Sacrifice in the fore-cited passage of *Hosea*, is meant of the Ceremonial Sacrifice of the Law, amongst which the Sacrifice of Christ ought not to be reckoned; for after God had said, *I desired Mercy and not Sacrifice*, he presently addeth, *and the knowledge of God more than Burnt Offerings.* By which it appeareth that by Sacrifice he meaneth such Sacrifice as was joyned with Burnt Offerings, according to the prescript of the Law, to which *Jer. Chap. 7. 21.* alluding, saith, *Put your Burnt Offerings to your Sacrifices and eat Flesh.* I should take little Comfort in discovering these shameful mistakes of yours, were it not that I saw you went about to Rob us of our Christian Liberty, and to bring us into Bondage unto the weak and Beggarly Rudiments of the World. Fourthly, our Saviour Warrants the violation of the Sabbath in his Disciples, because *the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath*, and therefore ought to yield to the Necessities of man. Which thing also sheweth that the Sabbath is *Ceremonial*. For as for *Moral Duties*, the Scripture testifieth that man was made for them. Thus *Acts 17. 26, 27.* Paul saith, that *God made mankind to seek the Lord*, which all will confess to be a *Moral Duty*. And *Ephes. 2. 10.* *We are his making* (so I am told the Greek word signifieth) *Created in Christ Jesus unto good Works, which God hath before prepared, that we should walk in them.* But the good Works enjoyned in the Gospel, are by all confessed to be *Moral*, and not *Ceremonial Performances*.

Fifthly, It is said, that *for as much as the Sabbath was made for Man, and not Man for the Sabbath, therefore the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath.* Which words imply, that the

the Son of Man could, in case of Mans Necessity, dispence with the Law of the Sabbath, otherways how was he Lord of it? For doth not his being Lord of it, signifie that he was above it, and had Power over it? But no where is it said or intimated in the Scripture, that the Son of Man, yea, any other, is Lord of *Moral* Duties, they being in their own Nature indispensable, in that they agree to Man, as he is a Rational and Sociable Creature, and so bound to Act Reasonably and Sociably. Neither did you ever Read that such Duties have in Scripture been by Christ dispensed with: Wherefore those Expressions, of yours, which you so often inculcate in your Book, *That the Sabbath is made for Man, and that Christ is Lord of the Sabbath*, do (being rightly understood) subvert your Opinion, intimating that the Sabbath is Ceremonial, and may Lawfully upon an emergent Necessity of Man be dispensed with. That the Walls of *Jericho* were surrounded for seven days together, and consequently on the Sabbath is evident. But that the seventh day of the surrounding was the Sabbath, appeareth not out of the Text. For to evince that, you must shew, that they began to surround the City on the first day of the Week, whereas no such thing is so much as hinted in the Sacred Text. Wherefore that which you infer from thence, touching the extraordinary Dignity that was put upon the Sabbath, in that the City was taken Miraculously upon that day, is altogether groundless. Howbeit, this is certain from the story, (as I before hinted) that the Sabbath was broken, in as much as to Compass a City in a Hostile manner on that day, is to Profane it; by Working upon it, contrary to the Fourth Commandment.

So that this plainly sheweth the Observation of the Sabbath to be no *Moral* Duty, as being dispensed with. What you farther say of *Jericho's being a Type of Babylon, and of the man of sin's changing the Times*, are more groundless surmises, than what you before spake concerning the taking of *Jericho* on the Sabbath-day, as would easily appear, if you attempted to confirm those Notions of yours by the Scripture rightly and soundly Interpreted.

Pag. 20. Here you confels as much as I desire, namely, *That the Institution of the Sabbath cometh only from the power and authority of God.* For this unanswerably proves it to be *Ceremonial*; the difference between a *Moral* and *Ceremonial* Law lying in this, that the one is Naturally written in the Heart of Man, and so ought to be Observed, though God had not Commanded it; (whence the Heathens, to whom God had not made known himself, nor given any Commandments and Judgments, are nevertheless grievously Reprehended by the Prophets for not Observing *Moral* Duties; See pag. 7. fore-going.) Whereas *Ceremonial* Laws depend meerly upon the Will and Authority of God Commanding them. Where I admire that you should Reprove me for suggesting *That the Sabbath receives Being, and takes Rise from a Reason without us.* For is not the Power, Will, and Authority of God, upon which only you your self ground the Observation of the Sabbath something without us?

Pag. 21. How irrational therefore are your words, where (contradicting your self) you say, *'Tis unseemly to assert, that the Ceremonial Laws did ever rise from any Reason without us, for even their spring-head was Originally from the Pleasure and Providence of God?* For is not the Pleasure of God a Reason without us? And are not such Laws as flow from the Pleasure of the Law-giver meer *Placits*, and so *Positive* and *Ceremonial* things? For instance, the sacrificing of Beasts, was it not a thing that sprang from the Pleasure of God? And is it not therefore *Ceremonial*, there being no other Obligation upon Men to perform it, but the Command of God? so that the injunction of God about that matter now ceasing, we are no longer bound thereunto. 'Tis true, that *Moral* Precepts are sometimes in the Law enforced by reason from without, as Obedience to God, from deliverance out of *Egypt*; but then these Precepts do not Originally spring from such Reasons, but from the Law of Nature, to which those other Considerations are added, and consequently Men have a new Obligation to such Duties, which they were before bound by Nature to perform.

Pag. 24. To prove that the sabbath is not *Moral*, I alledged that it is called a *Sign*, and a *Covenant*. The Adverſary wanting a ſolid Answer hercunto, and intending here, as he doth *pag. 16.* to make a Flourish, ſaith, that I may as well prove our Saviour himſelf to be a Ceremony, for as much as the ſame Titles are given to him; though the Paſſages that he citeth, reach not home to his purpoſe (as will eaſily appear to him that ſhall conſider them with thoſe concerning the Sabbath.) Yet I willing joyn Iſſue with him, and affirm that in as much as Chriſt is called a Sign and a Covenant, it doth unavoidably follow, that the Myſtery of Chriſt is ſuch a thing as dependeth not on the Law and light of Nature; but only on the good pleaſure of God, as Chriſt himſelf intimateth, *John 6. 40.* *This is the will of him that ſent me; that whoſeever beholdeth the Son, and believed on him, ſhould have Eternal Life.* And *Paul Eph. 1. 5.* ſaith plainly, *Having predeſtinated us unto the adoption of Children through Jeſus Chriſt unto himſelf, according to the good pleaſure of his will.* Neither will it be poſſible to prove that by the light of Nature (ſetting aſide the Commandment of God) we are directed to believe in Chriſt, and expect Salvation from him. So that I retort the Adverſaires ſimilitude upon him, and conclude firmly from thence, that as the Myſtery of Chriſt is not Moral, but dependeth on the good Pleaſure of God, ſo neither is the obſervation of the Sabbath which he compareth therewith.

Pag. 25. In this Page the Adverſary ſpeaketh out, and ſheweth, that though he often mentions the Name of Chriſt, and Chriſtians, yet his deſign is, by this Doctrine of the Seventh-day-Sabbath, to bring us from Chriſt unto *Moses*, for he expreſſly ſaith, *I know no newer Covenant than the Covenant of Life and Peace, which was made with Levi,* *Mal. 2. 5.* For is not Gods Covenant with Chriſt Jeſus newer than his Covenant with *Levi*? Or is not his Covenant with *Levi*, that which he made by the hand of *Moses* the *Levite*, when *Israel* came out of *Egypt*? Why is Chriſt called *the Mediator of a better Covenant*, and thereby oppoſed to the *Levitical Priests*, *Heb. 11. 21, 22.* If there be no newer Covenant of Life and Peace, than that which of Old was made with *Levi*? Behold therefore

fore, O ye Brethren that love the Lord Jesus and his Gospel, how the Adversary here doth cast off his Vizard, acknowledging no new Covenant to be made with Christ, but that the old Covenant with *Levi* is still in force. For if this be so, why do we not presently renounce the Gospel, and take upon us the Observance of the Law, which was received under the *Levitical* Priesthood? Why do we not trun *Jews*? For you see this is the Mark, at which the Adversary, notwithstanding his specious Pretences to the contrary, doth indeed aim.

Page 27. That none before *Moses* time was under Reproof, either from their own Conscience, or from God (that we Read of) for breaking the Sabbath, is an evident Proof, that the Sabbath is not *Moral*; else why should they not have been Reproved for the breach of that as well as of other Duties, which are confessedly *Moral*? Neither is it to the matter to say as you do, that the Sabbath was in force before *Moses*, unless you prove it to be therefore in force, because the Law of Nature did suggest it unto Men, which you have not yet, nor ever shall be able to evince. If you thereupon demand, how it could be, that God should have Commanded it from the beginning, and yet the Patriarchs not be blamed for neglecting it? I Answer, because it was grown out of knowledge, as that passage, *Neb. 9. 14.* sheweth, where it is said, *Thou madest known unto them thy Holy Sabbath.* But none can be justly reprov'd for not observing a *Ceremonial* and *Positive* Law, when it is once grown out of knowledge and forgotten; and this is the Reason, why the word *Remember* is prefixed to this, and to no other of the Ten Commandments; implying that the Sabbath, being of Institution, and no part of the Law of Nature, as the other Nine Commandments are, might in after Ages, as well as it had formerly, be utterly forgotten Page 34. Though the word Sabbath be not mentioned *Exod. 16. 4, 5.* yet is the thing it self there plainly intimated, when God saith, *On the sixth day they shall prepare what they bring in, and it shall be twice as much as they gathered daily.* For why should that which they brought in on the sixth day be prepared, and be double to what they gathered daily, but because they might not prepare or gather any *Manna* on the Seventh day, but ought

ought to keep it for a Sabbath of Rest? So that it is truly affirmed by *Moses*, ver. 23. that the Lord had said, *to morrow is the Rest of the Holy Sabbath*, in that he had before Commanded them to gather on the sixth day twice as much as they did upon any other day, and also to prepare it. Wherefore it is undeniable that God Commanded the Sabbath in the fourth and fifth Verse of the sixteenth Chapter of *Exodus*.

Pag. 40. That Text, *Col. 2. 16, 17.* is so directly opposite to the Adversaries Opinion, and shineth with so full a Light, that it is no marvel that he should strive might and main to raise up a whole Cloud of Dust to obscure it; but all in vain, seeing he may sooner darken the Sun it self. For first, when the Apostle here saith, *Let no man judge you in meat or drink*, doth he not thereby signifie, that the difference of meats and drinks formerly enjoyed by God, doth now cease? Secondly, when he addeth, *or in respect* (so I am told) ought the words to be rendred, as will appear by comparing *2 Cor. 3. 10.* and Chap. 9. 3. (where the same expression is so used) *of an Holy-day* (or *Feast*) or *New Moon*, or *Sabbath*: Doth not this in like manner shew, that neither the *Feasts* or *New Moons* formerly Commanded to the People of God, do more bind Christians than the difference of meats and drinks aforesaid. But if they be not obliged to observe them, they are by the same Reason as little bound to keep the Sabbath; which is here put in the same Rank with *Feasts* and *New Moons*: Neither can it be denied that by the Sabbath is here meant the Seventh-day-Sabbath. For there is no place in all the New Testament where the word Sabbath (in Greek *σαββατον* or *σάββατον*) doth signifie any other than the Seventh-day-Sabbath. Yea, being simply put (so that it is not said, *such or such a time shall be to you a Sabbath*, or *to the Land*) it doth always in the Old Testament denote the Seventh-day-Sabbath. Again, the Sabbath is here distinguished from *Feasts* and *New Moons*, and therefore can be understood of no other than the Seventh-day-Sabbath. For though, as you Object, the word *Feasts*, when put by it self, may comprehend the Seventh-day-Sabbath (as perhaps it doth, *Lev. 23. 23.*) yet when it is joyned with *Sabbaths*, it cannot do so (for then the same thing would be

twice expressed) and this is manifest from that Text, *Lev. 23. 37, 38. These are the Feasts of the Lord, which you shall Proclaim to be Holy Convocations, besides the Sabbaths of the Lord.* As for other Sabbaths besides the Seventh-day-Sabbath, they are comprehended under the word *Feasts*: So that in the foresaid passage, *Col. 2. 16.* by Sabbath joyned with *Feasts* and *New Moons*, can no other Sabbath be possibly meant but the *Seventh-day-Sabbath*, as those instances which in my former Discourse I alledged out of the Old Testament do clearly prove, neither shall so much as one instance be alledged out of the New to the contrary. And whereas you further Object (though as little to the purpose as before) that we shall find one Sabbath so far from being a *Feast*, that it is the day of severe Affliction. Have I not here just cause again to tax you for Quibbling upon words, seeing it is apparent from the 4th. Verse of this 23d. of *Levit.* that by *Feasts* are not meant times of *Folly-cheer*, but *Holy Convocations*, wherein men ceased from their ordinary Labour, and were employed in Religious Duties, whether they made Mirth, or Afflicted their Souls? In the third place (to return to the fore-cited Text, *Col. 2. 16, 17.*) Where the Apostle super-addeth, *which are a shadow of things to come, but the Body is of Christ.* This hath relation to the five things mentioned in the 16th. Verse, at least to that which is immediately fore-going the Sabbath. So that the Sabbath (distinguished from *Feasts* and *New Moons*, and so according to the perpetual usage of the Scriptures, signifying no other than the *Seventh-day-Sabbath*) is by the Apostle Paul called a *shadow*, the Body whereof is exhibited to us in Christ, namely, in the Everlasting Sabbath of the Kingdom of Heaven. Wherefore to bring us back to shadows, after that the Body is come, is not only Preposterous; but tendeth to the enslaving us under the Rudiments of the World, and instead of Sons to make us Servants.

Pag. 57. For as much as the Adversary, not only here, but elsewhere in his Book saith, that Christ delivered the Law to *Israel* at Mount *Sinai*. I would fain hear from him why the Scriptures, *Heb. 8. 6.* and *12. 24.* calleth Jesus the Mediator of a *New and better Covenant*? For certainly this implyeth, that
some

some other Person was the Mediator of the Old and wofe *Covenant*. Again, why doth the Apostle *John* prefer Christ before *Moses* in this regard, namely, that *whereas the Law was given by Moses, Grace and Truth came by Jesus Christ*, Chap. 1. 17. Undoubtedly this strongly Argueth that the Law was not given by Christ; wherefore you deal ridiculously, in desiring me to take heed of perswading others to transgress any one word that Christ immediately Commanded at Mount *Sinai*. To what purpose do you bestow such Elegies upon the Law of God?

Pag. 61. Is it not to insinuate into the Minds of the unwary Readers, that I am a Contemner, yea, an Opposer thereof? Whereas I think very Honourably of it, as being Holy, Just, and Good: Only I believe (what you your self dare not disavow) that all the *Ceremonial* and *Shadowy* things thereof are now done away in Christ. And that the Sabbath is one of those *Ceremonial* and *Shadowy* things, I have undenyably evinced, as from other passages of the Scripture, so especially from that Text of *Paul*, Col. 2. 16, 17. which plainly signifieth, that as the difference of Meats, and Drinks, and the Celebration of Feasts and New Moons, so also the keeping of the Sabbath was a *shadow* of things to come, the Body whereof is now held forth unto us in Christ.

Pag. 68. As for that passage, *Mat. 24. 21.* where our Saviour Christ bids his Disciples pray *that their flight might not be on the Sabbath day*, the words plainly intimate, that it would be Lawful to flee on that day (and consequently that the Law concerning the Sabbath would cease, whereby it was enjoined, *that no man should remove out of his place on the seventh day*, *Exod. 16. 29.*) The words (I say) plainly intimate, that it would be Lawful to flee upon that day, otherwise why should they pray, that their flight might not be then? Nevertheless it would not be expedient, in that the unbelieving *Jews*, thinking the Sabbath still to remain, would be ready to offer Violence to such as should attempt to fly on that day. Yea, perhaps the believing *Jews* themselves, not understanding their own Liberty in Christ, but thinking the Sabbath still in force, would be exceedingly grieved, if

they should be reduced to a Necessity either of Perishing, or of Flying on the Sabbath day. Of which thing I will speak more anon. If you Reply, that Christ calleth it the Sabbath in relation to the time that should be long after his death; whereas I believe that by his death the difference of times, in point of Holiness, and consequently the Observation of the Sabbath, was abolished, according to the Doctrine of *Paul*, *Col. 2. 14.* I Answer, that the Scripture calls the times of the *Jewish* Feasts, after the death of Christ, by the same names they had formerly. See *Acts 12. 3.* and *Chap. 20. 16.* when notwithstanding you your self will not deny, that the Obligation to observe those Feasts, had then ceased.

Page 69. What needed the mention of the first day of the Week, commonly called Sunday, when I never affirmed, that Christ hath left us any Precept for the Observation of the same. Howbeit, we have the Practice of all believing *Gentiles*, down from the Apostles unto our time, who have unanimously and constantly observed the same, as being that day, which is in *Rev. 1.* called the *Lords day*; which perpetual Custom of Christians is sufficient to Warrant our keeping of the *Lords day*: Whereas no such thing can be alledged to justify the observing of the Seventh-day-Sabbath. And therefore when you say, *that Christ hath established in his House all the Moral Duties of Moses House*, it is nothing to the purpose, unless you first prove, that the keeping of the Sabbath is a Moral Duty, the contrary whereof, my comparison taken out of the Scripture, doth evince. For Christ being as Faithful in the House of God as *Moses*. If it had been his Will that his Disciples should have observed the Seventh-day-Sabbath, he would have expressly enjoined it, and not have left them to gather it by I know not what uncertain Consequences, such as you, and others of your Opinion make use of. For *Moses* openly and frequently Commanded to the *Israelites* that they should keep the Seventh-day-Sabbath. So that your proceeding herein is just like the dealing of the Papist about the Popes pretended Supremacy. For when it is Questioned whether he be the Judge of all emergent Controversys amongst Christians, the Papist having no such Precept from Christ in the Scripture, where Christ Ordaineth the Pope or Bishop of
Rome,

Rome to such Judicature, bring instead thereof certain far-fetch'd probabilities and consequences to prove it. In like manner you when you are urged by me and other Christians to shew where Christ (who was as faithful in the House of God as *Moses*) hath Commanded his followers to keep the Sabbath, alledge Ordinances for other things, and similitudes, and strains of your own Poetry, and other like impertinencies, without producing so much as one undoubted Precept for the same. But whereas you say, that Christ hath confirmed all the *Moral* Precepts of *Moses*: Who denies it? You should have done well, not to have begged the thing in Question, but to have proved that the Celebration of the Sabbath is a *Moral* Duty. But this you have not yet been, nor ever shall be able to perform.

Pag. 79. That *Paul* excluded the Law touching the Seventh-day-Sabbath out of the Counsel of God towards believing *Gentiles*, is evident, both from his perpetual silence in his Writings touching such matters (the contrary whereof you being unable to prove, do here, as well as elsewhere turn aside to impertinencies) and also by his ranking the Sabbath among shadows, *Col. 2. 16, 17.* for the not observing of which, no man ought (as you, not regarding his Injunction, rashly do) to Judge and Censure others as Offenders.

Pag. 80. I wonder at your boldness to aver, That the Apostles did own the Sabbaths Observation, as a great virtue, and admonish Christians to beware of the breach thereof as a most provoking sin; and that this is evident from *Mt. 5. 19.* where it is said, *Whosoever therefore shall break one of the least of these Commandments, and teach men so, shall be called least in the Kingdom of Heaven.* Is here (or in the whole Chapter) so much as one word of the Sabbaths; yea doth not this expression, *the least of these Commandments*, argue that he spake of his own Commandments, differing from those in the Law? For should you understand it of the Commandments in the Law, would it not from thence unavoidably follow, that Christians are bound to keep all the Law of *Moses*; even to the least Commandment thereof; So that of Christians we must all presently turn Jews. And whether this be not indeed the bottom of your design, you give me too much reason to suspect, as by other expressions of your,

yours, so especially by that down-right Jewish Speech of yours, p. 25. where you say that you know no newer Covenant, than the Covenant of Life and Peace that was made with Levy. As for that other Text, from whence you endeavour to prove, *That the Apostles did own the Sabbath observati- on as a great vertue*, namely Luke 23. 56. where it is said, *They rested on the Sabbath, according to the Commandment*? Is here any mention made of the Apostles, or of their owning the observation of the Sabbath, after the death of Christ? Is not that which is here spoken of the *Commandment*, meant of the *Commandment in the Law*? which the godly Jewish Women here spoken of, knew not to be abolished; as neither did the believing Jews in general a long time after, as you may see, *Acts 21. 20* where the Apostle James saith to Paul, *Thou see'st, Brother, how many thousands of Jews there are that believe, and they are all Zealous of the Law*. But as for any Commandment of Christ about the Sabbath, you do not alledge any such out of the Gospel (there being none) but instead thereof bring uncertain Consequences.

Pag. 83. In this Page your Judaism again breaks forth, and plainly discovereth it self, when you tell us, *that Moses Writings were then* (namely, when that Decree, *Acts 15. 28, 29.* was made) *esteemed the most Righteous Rule for true Believers*. Which words of yours are directly opposite both to the Epistle of the Apostle, set down in the foresaid Chapter (where they blame such as taught the Disciples that they ought to keep the Law) as also to the words of Christ himself, *Matt. 28. 20. Teaching them to observe not whatsoever Moses, but whatsoever Christ had commanded them*. Yea, your words make the Law more Righteous than the Gospel; for if the Law be the *most Righteous Rule for Believers*, there is no other Rule *so Righteous* as it, and consequently the Rule of the Gospel must stoop to the Law. By this may easily be perceived what the tendency of your Doctrine is, and how by those goodly words of Gods *Sanctifying Presence on the Sabbath day*, and the like, you go about to beguile the simple.

Pag. 84. This last Argument alledged by me out of *Rom. 12. 2, 3, &c.* is like to that other, drawn from *Col. 2. 16, 17.* and

it

it doth so fully and exactly determine the business touching the Ceremoniality of the Seventh-day-Sabbath, that it is a wonder how any man professing himself a Christian, and to own the Authority of the New Testament, should make any scruple of this matter. And you your self sufficiently shew by your many turnings and windings in putting off this Portion of Scripture, that you could by no means abide the force thereof. For when it is said, *ver. 2. One man believes he may eat all things, another being weak, eats herbs.* Doth not this clearly imply, that the difference of Meats formerly observed according to the will of God, whether before or after the Law, doth now cease? For that there was distinction between clean and unclean Beasts and Fowls, before the Law; and that by the approbation of the Lord God himself, is apparent from *Gen. 28. 20.* Also that by *clean* Beasts and Fowls, are meant such as may Lawfully be eaten; by *unclean*, such as may not, is evident from *Lev. 11. 3, 4, 46, 47.* So that if your Exception concerning days, were true, namely, that the fifth Verse meant of such days only as were Ordained to be kept Holy under the Law, and not of the Sabbath, which was Instituted before the Law; I might by the same Reason say as much of Meats, namely, that the Apostle meaneth such a difference of Meats as was introduced by the Law: so that still those Meats remain unclean to us Christians, which were by God himself called unclean before the Law, and they (it is likely) were as many if not the very same with those under the Law. And therefore by this kind of Arguing we are not sure of having attained any Liberty in this kind by means of Christ. You may by this see how absurd your exceptions are, & that as the difference of Meats, whether in Relation to the Will of God before or after the Law, is now taken away; so in like manner the difference of days, and therefore that none is by the Commandment of God to be now esteemed more Holy than another. For the Apostle plainly affirmeth (without reprehending it) that one man esteemeth every day alike, and that he which esteemeth not one day above another esteemeth it not unto the Lord. But you have yet another exception, and that more strange than the former, for you say, that by every day the Apostle only intends;

tends every one of the six daies, because, *Exod. 16. 4.* (which is the first place where this expression occurreth) when the Lord saith, the people shall go out together a certain rate every day, there is meant every one of the six daies. But I pray you tell me why, when you cited this place out of *Exodus* you would not take so much pains to consult the Hebrew Text, you having skill in that Language? Or, if that seemed too painful, why you did not cast you eye upon what the Translators set in the Margin? For they there tell you, that the words in Hebrew are, *the portion of a day in its day, which being so, your exception, that by every day, Rom. 14. 5. is meant only every one of the six daies of the Week,* hath not so much as any colourable warrant from the aforesaid Text in *Exodus*; and consequently as your Exception was but a meer evasion to my Argument, drawn from the aforesaid Text of the Apostle it remains invincible, namely, that not only the difference of Meats, but also the difference of daies, is, (as to any Law of God) now taken away, and accordingly they are but weak and ill informed Believers, who think the Obligation of the Seventh-day-Sabbath doth still remain.

FINIS.